



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,873	11/21/2003	Shoichiro Yokoi	153A 3483	3050
7590 05/18/2005			EXAMINER	
Koda & Androlia 2029 Century Park East Suite 1140 Los Angeles, CA 90067-2983			TRAN, THUY V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2821	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,873

Applicant(s)

YOKOI ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy V. Tran

Art Unit

2821

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment submitted on 03/07/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a response to the Applicants' amendment submitted on March 7th, 2005. In virtue of this amendment, claims 1-7 are currently presented in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,951) in view of Ozaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,089,887).

With respect to claim 1, Yoneyama et al. discloses, in Figs. 1-3, a vehicle headlamp comprising (1) a beam radiation unit that includes a discharge bulb [18] as a light source (see col. 1, line 61), (2) an illumination circuit unit [30] that illuminates the discharge bulb [18] provided in a lamp body [12], and (3) a cord [26] that connects the illumination circuit unit [30] and the discharge bulb [18], wherein the cord [26] is held at a middle portion thereof so as to be prevented from being moved with respect to the lamp body [12]. Yoneyama et al. further teach that the beam radiation unit including the bulb [18] seats on a socket [24] supported in the lamp body [12] (see Fig. 1). However, Yoneyama et al. does not explicitly teach that the beam radiation unit including the bulb [18] is rotatably thereon.

Ozaki discloses, in Fig. 1, a vehicle headlamp device comprising a beam radiation unit including a discharge bulb [1] that seats on a socket [11] and is laterally rotatably supported in a lamp body (see col. 3, lines 35-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to implement the vehicular headlamp of Yoneyama et al. by employing a rotatable socket, in lieu of the socket of Yoneyama et al., so as to conveniently remove the discharge bulb, such as for replacement, with a rotation force since such a use of the rotatable socket for the stated purpose has been well known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Ozaki (see col. 3, lines 51-54).

With respect to claim 4, Yoneyama et al. discloses, in Figs. 1-3, a vehicle headlamp comprising (1) a beam radiation unit that includes a discharge bulb [18] as a light source (see col. 1, line 61), (2) an illumination circuit unit [30] that illuminates the discharge bulb [18] provided in a lamp body [12], and (3) a cord [26] that connects the illumination circuit unit [30] and the discharge bulb [18], wherein the vehicular headlamp is provided with a cord holding means [28] that holds the cord [26] (see col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 1) between the illumination circuit unit [30] and the discharge bulb [18] to prevent the cord [26] from moving with respect to the lamp body [12]. Yoneyama et al. further teach that the beam radiation unit including the bulb [18] seats on a socket [24] supported in the lamp body [12] (see Fig. 1). However, Yoneyama et al. does not explicitly teach that the beam radiation unit including the bulb [18] is rotatably thereon.

Ozaki discloses, in Fig. 1, a vehicle headlamp device comprising a beam radiation unit including a discharge bulb [1] that seats on a socket [11] and is rotatably supported in a lamp body (see col. 3, lines 35-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to implement the vehicular headlamp of Yoneyama et al. by employing a rotatable socket, in lieu of the socket of Yoneyama et al., so as to conveniently remove the discharge bulb, such as for

Art Unit: 2821

replacement, with a rotation force since such a use of the rotatable socket for the stated purpose has been well known in the art as evidenced by the teachings of Ozaki (see col. 3, lines 51-54).

With respect to claim 5, Yoneyama et al. discloses, in Figs. 1-3, that the cord holding means [28] comprises a clamp member [28] that is attached to the illumination circuit unit [30] (see Fig. 1) and is provided with a cord holding element [28a] that holds the cord [26] on the clamp member [28].

With respect to claim 7, Yoneyama et al. discloses, in Figs. 1-3, that the cord holding means [28] comprises a clamp [28] that is formed in the lamp body [12] (see col. 4, lines 33-34).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-3 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Prior art fails to disclose or fairly suggest:

- A vehicular headlamp wherein the beam radiation unit is laterally rotatable in a bracket that is inclinably supported in the lamp body, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for in claim 2 (claim 3 would be allowable since it is dependent on claim 2); and
- A vehicular headlamp wherein the cord holding means comprises a clamp formed in a bracket that supports the beam radiation unit in the lamp body, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for in claim 6.

Remarks and conclusion

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 03/07/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the Applicants' arguments on claim 1 in the fourth paragraph at page 3 in regard to the teachings of the cited prior art to Ozaki, the Examiner disagrees with the Applicants' statement that is "it teaches that the bulb would be installed in the beam radiation unit by rotating it and does not teach that the bulb would be laterally rotatably supported in the lamp body". Ozaki discloses in col. 3, lines 40-42, that the socket [11] is rotated so that the engagement protrusions [7, 7] are inserted into the engagement portion [19, 19], and in col. 3, lines 49-54, that the discharge lamp bulb [1] and socket [11] remain in the securing position until a rotation force is applied which is strong enough to cause the engagement protrusions [7, 7] to spread the width of the engagement grooves [17, 17] toward the introducing portions [18, 18]. Such a disclosure clearly indicates that the discharge lamp bulb seating on the socket [11] would be laterally rotatably supported in the lamp body. Therefore, claims 1, 4-5, and 7 remain rejected as being unpatentable over the teachings of Yoneyama et al. and Ozaki.

Inquiry


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1828. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM -5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2821

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

05/15/2005



THUY V. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER